

I mean, really, why have a Congress? The way it has been operating since I have been here, Mr. MEEK, and I have been here almost 2 full years now, why have a legislative branch? The rubber stamp, the rubber stamp that is used here by the Republicans and their leadership, you know, it makes having a Congress essentially unnecessary because they just do whatever the administration wants anyway.

Listen, I could go home and spend a lot more time with my family than come here and waste our time on naming post offices and banning horse slaughtering. And not that those things aren't important; they are important to some people, but they are not the priorities of this country. They are not the priorities of the people when we go walking down the street in our communities and when I go and take my kids to their soccer game and to dance class, when I get in my car and drive my minivan around town.

The people that I talk to, they don't get it. They are scratching their heads, and they don't understand the rhetoric that is coming out of here without any action, and they are yearning and begging us to give them a new direction. We have got to provide them with that new direction.

Mr. MEEK, we come to this floor every night as the 30-something Working Group, and I know we are about to wrap up here as we approach the end of our 60 minutes. We really appreciate the opportunity that Leader PELOSI gives us every night. And I want to direct our colleagues to our Web site, our 30-something Web site, [www.housedemocrats.gov/30something](http://www.housedemocrats.gov/30something). All of the charts that we have had out here are available on that Web site, and we encourage folks to e-mail us with comments and our colleagues to e-mail us with comments.

Mr. MEEK, I yield to you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

I want to thank the 30-Something Working Group for all the hard work. And we will be back next week, Mr. Speaker. We would like to thank the Democratic leader for allowing us to have the time.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and the honor of addressing you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I was listening to the presentation by the 30-Something Group here over the last hour, and quite often it redirects the message that I intend to come down to this floor to discuss, and of course this evening is no different.

Being a proud and committed member of the Republican Party, and when I hear continually the message, rubber-stamp Congress, rubber-stamp Con-

gress come out over here, and in the same breath the question, the President wants to privatize Social Security.

I don't know anybody that has advocated for the privatization of Social Security. I don't think you can find any seated Member of the Republican Congress or the President himself that has said, I want to privatize Social Security. So that is a scare tactic that is designed to spook people, but it surely is not something that is an objective revelation of the truth.

The President did, though, invest significant capital in reform of Social Security. It was the centerpiece in his second inaugural address. And after his second inaugural address, with great optimism and enthusiasm, the President went out and invested month after month after month in an effort to reform a Social Security program that will ultimately collapse, reform it for, not for the senior citizens. There was nothing in his proposal for the people who were 55 years old and up. There is not a way that we can make the actuarial numbers change that.

We keep our faith and keep our sacred covenant with the senior citizens. That is something that is clear throughout everybody in this Republican Conference and all the people that are involved in this policy that I know of: Keep the faith with the senior citizens.

I represent perhaps the most senior congressional district in America. Iowa has the largest percentage of its population over the age of 65 of any of the States in the Union, and in the congressional district that I represent, the 32 counties in western Iowa, I have 10 of the 12 most senior counties in Iowa. So I will argue that I represent a higher percentage of seniors perhaps than anyone else in the country. And yet they understand that we will keep our sacred covenant with the seniors. We will hold those benefits together.

There was nothing proposed by the President, nothing introduced by any member of this Republican Conference that would have reduced by a single dime, one single benefit to any senior citizen.

What was proposed was that a portion of young people's contributions to Social Security could go into a personal retirement account, a controlled account, the kind of an account that would be an approved account that would be the same thing as the Federal Retirement Investment Funds that many of us are part of, many Federal employees are a part of. In fact, all of them that have the ability to direct some of their funds into retirement do invest into that.

It was a wise and a prudent proposal. It was something that looked downrange. We know that Social Security starts to go into the red in about 2016, 2017. There is \$1.7 trillion in the Social Security trust fund. It is only a promise; they are only IOUs in a filing cabinet in Parkersburg, West Virginia.

That money will have to be paid back out of the labor of our children someday.

But the surplus growth stops in 2017 and it begins to decline until about 2042, where it is gone.

□ 2145

At that point, something has to happen. The President's looking downrange. A lot of us have looked downrange. We didn't get to change the Social Security program as much as we would have liked to, we didn't propose to for our senior citizens, because you simply cannot do that because there is not time to grow funds.

So the proposal was for whom? Mr. Speaker, I will submit the proposal that the President burned up so much precious political capital on was for the 30-something group, and the 20-something group, and the teen-something group, and the younger-than-teen-something group, and for all generations yet to be born in America to be able to own a part of their own future, to be able to invest that and to be able to count on the same type of returns we have guaranteed as a sacred covenant to our seniors. That is what that is about.

And that is why it is so ironic that the 30-something group has rejected the very thing that is designed for their generation and mischaracterized it in a very cynical fashion and called it the privatization of Social Security. It is anything but. But it would be and it is still the best and only legitimate policy that has been offered before this Congress that can bring us out of almost certain bankruptcy of Social Security downrange, at a point where it will not be a factor to our senior citizens but for the 30-something group who have rejected it and decided to scare everyone in America for cynical political reasons.

The statement was also made by the gentleman from Florida that the only party that has balanced the budget is the Democratic Party, and that was without a single Republican vote. How can a statement like that be passed off here on the floor and not be challenged? We know when the budget was balanced. It was balanced after and only after Republicans took the majority in the United States Congress. And that happened in 1994.

I will say that the young people that came in here in this Congress and took over the majority in 1994 were committed, fiscally responsible people that came here to make a difference, and they did. They squeezed that budget down, Mr. Speaker. They challenged President Clinton, Mr. Speaker, and they took this thing down to the point where President Clinton refused to allow a continuing resolution that would have kept the government operating. The government was shut down not because Republicans spent too much money, Mr. Speaker, but because they hadn't spent enough money. And so the challenge laid. Government was shut down. Who would have to give in?

Finally, Republicans said, okay, we will give you a little more money, Mr. President, if that is what it takes to keep the government running, to keep things open, to keep services going to needy people. We will keep the government running by giving you some more money. And in spite of that, they still balanced the budget. The Republican majority in this Congress balanced the budget in spite of President Clinton, not because of him. And it sure in the world was not without a single Republican vote. It was only with Republican votes.

I guess I will say that it was with Republican leadership and Republican votes and perhaps some on the other side of the aisle did vote for that. They might make that argument, so I will just concede that point. But it surely wasn't Democrats balancing this, and it wasn't without a single Republican vote.

Again, the allegation: A streamline of rubber stamping. Think about that statement. Mr. Speaker, a streamline of rubber stamping. This Republican Congress rubber stamping the President? If that had been the case, the 30-something group and the rest of America would have had Social Security reform. They would have had the kind of program that would have allowed the younger generations to take a portion of their contributions and invest them so that they could ensure their own financial security.

If it had been a rubber stamp Congress, the President would have gotten what he wanted with Social Security reform, and I would have loved to have given it to him, because it was a good plan and a good proposal. But there wasn't a rubber stamp because there were enough Republicans that were, I will say, attacked relentlessly in their political campaigns by these kind of scare tactics that intimidated them to the point where they backed away from the Social Security reform, and we didn't quite have the 218 votes to do the thing that was best for America.

No rubber stamp for the President, because this Congress does think for itself. It is 435 independent minds, and it is 230 or 231 Republicans that absolutely come here with a mission in mind and they draw their own conclusions. They represent their districts and they represent the people in their districts and their carry their values here. We didn't have enough of a consensus. And I am frustrated. I would have liked to have rubber stamped that, because I had a chance to look at it and it was a good program, but we couldn't do it.

Then, if this is a rubber stamp Congress, it seems to me that the President came before the American people on about January 6 of 2004 and he made a speech that I will call the guest worker speech, and it was a major policy speech on what the President would have liked to have seen with immigration. Now, he did speak somewhat to enforcement, but I never got the thread

in that speech that that was the message at all. He wanted a guest worker, temporary worker program. And he said without that, we can't enforce the law on the rest of the criminals and the drug dealers that are coming across the border.

I don't agree with him on that. I think we have to cut down on that huge 4 million annual number of illegals, that huge human haystack coming across the border, and we have to seal the border. We have taken steps to do that today. But if the President would have had a rubber stamp Congress, he would have long ago, when he asked for a guest worker program from this Congress, and he went out hustling across this country, speaking over and over again of the need for a guest worker and temporary worker program, he would have had that. He would have had it a long time ago, Mr. Speaker, if this had been a rubber stamp Congress.

So there are three powerful things really wrong with the earlier statements. The rubber stamp itself is utterly wrong. We would have had Social Security if it had been a rubber stamp Congress and we would have had a guest worker program if it was a rubber stamp Congress. It was not. And those are probably two of the highest priorities the President has brought to this Congress in the 109th Congress, and neither one are law today or likely to become law any time soon.

Let me say also that when I listened to the gentleman from Florida say we have to rewrite that cartoon, that is a caricature that comes out here on the floor of Congress on a regular basis. He says I also have some facts over here. Well, I don't think the word also is going to apply, because from what I saw, they were not facts. They were not even solid opinions.

Then another statement that was made by the gentleman from Florida was, we don't have health care in America. We don't have health care in America? There is nobody in America that doesn't have health care, Mr. Speaker. Everyone has access to health care, including the 12 or 22 million illegals that come into this country and show up at our emergency rooms. Everyone has access to health care. No one is denied emergency health care.

Yes, there are people that are uninsured, and maybe more would be insured if someone was ever denied health care, but they are not, because we are a compassionate Nation and we take care of people in this country. We do not slam the door at any clinic or any hospital in the emergency room when people need help. We, at a minimum, stabilize them and, generally, we provide them with adequate care.

As a matter of fact, it isn't just people in America that have access to health care. It is people that live on our borders who have access to free American health care. A case in point would be that several months ago I was down on the southern border at Sasabe,

Arizona, and there at the port of entry station, as I walked in there to talk to some of the border patrol officers, and as I was speaking with the commander of that shift, we had only spoken for a minute or two when he got an emergency call and he said, excuse me, I have to take care of this. So he stepped away and made some calls, and when he came back he said, well, there has been a knifing on the other side of the border, just within a mile or so.

There is a community on the south side there that comes right up to the border. And, yes, it is a smugglers' community, and it swells by about 2,000 during the day, and those 2,000 disappear at night and a new bunch comes back again. They smuggle drugs through in holes through our border. A couple points to the east and a couple points to the west of that port of entry that allows legal traffic through, and perhaps 150 to 180 vehicles a day come through that port of entry at Sasabe, Arizona, and the estimate is that two crossings east and two crossings west, all four of them have more illegal traffic than there is legal traffic going through Sasabe.

But there, when I stood in Sasabe, Arizona, there was the emergency call. The commander of that shift made the calls and found out that there had been a fight on the other side of the border, and likely was over a drug deal, and that there was a young male individual, say in his early 20s, who was knifed over there and the ambulance was coming from Mexico into the United States. So our border patrol agent, and this being a routine act that happens, as he told me perhaps four times a quarter, so 16 times a year. What are the odds I would be standing there when that happened? But he made the calls. Routine.

He called two U.S. ambulances to come to that port of entry to meet the Mexican ambulance that was coming across the border, and he called the helicopter out of Tucson to come down and pick him up so they could life flight that person, of questionable character, who had been knifed in a fight that was likely over a drug conflict, life flight him up to the University Mercy Hospital at Tucson.

Well, as I stood there, we talked about that, and the two ambulances he had called from the U.S. arrived, I would say shortly after the ambulance came in from Mexico. It was about 15 minutes for the ambulance from Mexico and perhaps 25 minutes for the ambulances to come from the U.S. to that port of entry. The Mexican ambulance was just simply a meat wagon. It looked like an ambulance on the outside. On the inside there was a gurney and a wounded young male that had been knifed underneath the rubs up into the liver. At the time they didn't know if he had a punctured lung or not, but he needed oxygen. The U.S. ambulances had oxygen; the Mexican ambulance did not. The Mexican ambulance had surgical gloves and maybe a touch

or two of bandages here or there. No medicine, no oxygen, hardly anything to treat him with.

So the U.S. ambulances came in, they put oxygen on him, stabilized his condition, and got him to where he had as much care as they could provide. Then the helicopter landed, they loaded him on it and took him off to Tucson to the Intensive Care Unit up there. This was a Mexican national, wounded in a fight in Mexico, brought into the United States for health care through the port of entry, and the word is "paroled" to the hospital in the United States for the purposes of saving his life.

And the medical people did save his life. And I don't object to that. I don't think you can let people die. We do not let them die. We don't let them die outside the emergency rooms of our hospitals or our clinics. In fact, we bring people into the United States on a "parole" to give them free health care in order to save their life because we are a humanitarian nation.

The statement that we don't have health care in America couldn't be more false. Not only do we have health care for everyone in America, we have health care for people that are wounded outside of America and brought in here when we know there isn't a chance in the world they will pay a single dime for that.

And, by the way, I went to the hospital the next day to visit that individual, and I looked at the accounting on the cost, and it was roughly \$30,000 to fix him up and send him back to his home country. He was a rough looking individual, but he looked a lot better the next day than he did the night he was knifed in the liver.

So health care for everybody in America. Health care for people outside of America. It is false to say people don't have health care.

The picture of the handshake between Prime Minister Nouri Al-Maliki and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Because they shook hands, somehow the implication is, or the 30-something group would have you believe that that is some kind of a bond between Iraq and Iran and now they are going to conspire against the United States. For what purpose?

First, I would submit that I have shaken hands with a lot of people, and I generally smile when I do that. I would wonder if there is anyone that serves in this Congress, out of the 435, that hasn't at some point shaken hands with their opponent in their political race. Doesn't mean they are your enemy. They are not. They are just your opponent. But we shake hands with all kinds of people, and the implication cannot be drawn because that two national leaders shook hands that somehow they are conspiring. Not at all.

What one can presume from that is that they have diplomatic relations, Mr. Speaker. And those diplomatic relations, then, can turn into something

good rather than something bad. From 1980 until 1988, the Iranians and the Iraqis fought each other, and over a million people were killed in that conflict. I don't think anyone in the world wants to see that again. I am glad they are shaking hands. I don't expect they are conspiring. In fact, I don't think so because I listened to the speech that was given here on the floor of this Congress by Prime Minister Nouri Al-Maliki.

And the statement was made by the gentleman from Florida that the Prime Minister said bad things about Israel here on this floor. So I took the trouble to download the speech and read every single word in this and looked for any reference to Israel whatsoever, good or bad.

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, I am going to include this for the RECORD and challenge anyone in America to find a reference to Israel in this speech by Prime Minister Maliki. If they can find some oblique reference, I would be very interested in what he might have said that could be interpreted by the gentleman from Florida as being a bad thing about Israel.

As I read through the speech, I found some interesting statements that should be brought up, rebuttals to the remarks made as the picture was held up here tonight.

One of the statements by Prime Minister Maliki was, speaking of September 11, "Your loss on that day was a loss of all mankind, and our loss today is a loss for all free people."

He continued, "And wherever humankind suffers a loss at the hands of terrorists, it is a loss of all humanity." We are bound in this together.

He continued, "It is your duty and our duty to defeat this terror. Iraq is the front line in this struggle, and history will prove that the sacrifices of Iraqis for freedom will not be in vain. Iraqis are your allies in the war on terror."

Do you think Admadinejad might have downloaded the speech? He has to be aware of this because this speech was as public as anything that the Prime Minister of Iraq has ever done. I am proud of the words he spoke here, and he could feel that he meant it.

He spoke about, history will record the bravery and the humanity, but he said the fate of your country and ours is tied. The fate of Iraq and that of the United States is tied.

"Should democracy be allowed to fail in Iraq and terror permitted to triumph, then the war on terror will never be won elsewhere."

Mr. Speaker, this statement, made by Prime Minister Maliki here on the floor of this Congress not that long ago, July 26, 2006, is a seminal statement of this global war on terror and the seminal statement of the political campaigns that are going on between now and November 7, because the American people need to understand

what happens if we don't persevere and ultimately succeed with a free country in Iraq.

Prime Minister Maliki's statement: The fate of our country and yours is tied; should democracy be allowed to fail in Iraq and terror permitted to triumph, then the war on terror will never be won elsewhere. Think of the implications of that statement, "The war on terror will never be won elsewhere," Mr. Speaker. If we should not persevere in Iraq, as many on this side of the aisle would like to do, sack up their bats and go home, that is the attitude I pick up, they are trying to convince us we cannot prevail.

In fact, I happened to have read at least significant parts of von Clausewitz's book on war. He states that the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war. The enemy's will and ability to conduct war, I reduce that down into the Steve King vernacular, which is, a war is over when the losing side realizes they have lost.

There is will and ability as stipulated by von Clausewitz in his book on war, and part of the object of war is to destroy their ability militarily to conduct war and to destroy their will. When they run out of men and material, it breaks their will down.

But the strength of the will to conduct war is an integral part of the strength of a nation. If you can break down that will, it is cheaper to break down the will than the military. It is cheaper in lives, it is cheaper in treasure. So a very essential part of conducting war is to destroy the enemy's will to fight.

Instead, we have people on the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, that continually, every opportunity they get, come down here, and they must forget, at least that is the best characterization I can come up with, they must forget when they speak here, Mr. Speaker, their words are taken down and their words are reflected across through the Internet. Their words are transmitted around the world. And the leaders of our enemy, al Qaeda and other terrorist groups, as well as their rank-and-file members, are watching on al-Jazeera. They are watching on the Internet. They are watching as these words unfold, and they are encouraged by the words of defeat that I hear on the other side of the aisle. In the end, it costs American lives.

But Prime Minister Maliki of Iraq said the war on war will never be won elsewhere should we allow ourselves to fail in Iraq.

Imagine if we deployed troops out of Iraq, pulled them back inside this shore, curled America into a fetal position and guarded every school, every baseball game and football game, every bus stop and hospital, and still watched the attacks come, especially on our women and children, turn the United States of America into one huge Israel. But no matter where terrorists attack us, we could never launch another foreign exposition because politically we

could not get it out of this Congress because they would point and say, it is another Iraq. Look, we lost in Iraq.

Some of the people on the other side of the aisle went to Iraq and surrendered before we liberated them. Now they are redefining what failure is and saying, I predicted it.

We cannot let this country fail, Mr. Speaker. We have a destiny that we need to fulfill and that destiny promotes freedom throughout the globe and throughout the ages.

Maliki said in his speech, Iraqis have tasted freedom and we will defend it absolutely. He was interrupted with thunderous applause for that statement. And he reached out to us and let us know that it is radical Islam, not Islam, that is our enemy. He gave us a line from the Koran. He said, "God says in the Koran", notice he referenced God, "surely we have honored all children of Adam." The brotherhood of man and woman is tied together in the reference to the Koran made by Prime Minister Maliki.

He said, "I believe these human rights are not an artifact, a construct reserved for the few. They are a divine entitlement for all."

What an American vision. What a statement to make on the floor of Congress. It resonates with patriotic Americans. It resonates with all people.

He continued, "It is on this unwavering belief that we are determined to build our nation, a land whose people are free, whose air is liberty, and where the rule of law is supreme."

He continued and said, "This is the new Iraq which is emerging from the ashes of a dictatorship despite the carnage of extremists, a country which represents international conventions and practices noninterference in the international affairs of others."

Just a portion of this speech, nothing in here about Israel. There is plenty in here about freedom and about the aspirations of a newly freed people. As I have looked them in the eye over in Iraq in the times that I have been there, I have seen that desire to build a country and a nation.

I gave a speech to the Baghdad chamber of commerce on a hot August day; and they asked me shortly before we arrived at the hotel in Baghdad. It was the hotel that was rocketed while Wolfowitz was there some few years ago. And so I said, yes, it fits in my schedule, I will do that.

I walked in the room. The count was 57 Iraqis and members of the chamber of commerce sitting at their dinner tables. They started to introduce me, but time was short. I wanted to know, where is my interpreter.

They said we don't have an interpreter; this chamber of commerce speaks English. I thought that is quite unusual to be in a country like Iraq and be able to address a group of people, 57 strong, business leaders in Baghdad, and have them all speaking English.

I gave a speech, and they laughed at the right time and had the right reactions. They spoke English. They came up afterwards and surrounded me with their business cards and desire and ideas to rebuild Iraq. It was encouraging to watch the spirit within them. If they can get the oil out of the ground and get the revenue stream coming back into that country, they will be a long way along in their recovery.

The argument that this is a situation when we go alone, repeated over and over again; the gentleman from Florida made that statement, we went it alone in Iraq. I have been over to Iraq a number of times. I remember standing in the headquarters of the Coalition forces in Basra. General Dutton of the British army was there. As we stood there and had an informal conversation, I began looking at the flags on the shoulders of the soldiers. The Coalition troops have the same uniform with their flag on the shoulders.

I took pictures so I could remember which nations were represented, and I can remember a few. Great Britain, yes. The Netherlands, yes. Romania was there, the Australians were there. The Poles were there. The Danes were there. There were probably three or four other countries represented just in a random group that were standing around there, the Coalition Forces.

I don't think the gentleman from Florida went to visit the Coalition Forces. He visited the American troops and forgot there were thousands of troops there that came from other countries and have been in Iraq from the beginning and have stayed there. In fact, the Japanese sent 1,000 troops into Iraq because they understand the value of freedom, even though they are a relatively passive nation.

Then the half a dozen or so generals that disagree with the President's policy in Iraq, and the continued argument that the President did not listen to his advisers. And now they have these retired generals that say, we should have done this or that. The President has always listened to his advisers and generals. He understands he is not going to call these shots from the Oval Office. He is going to say, you are going to have what you need to get this job done.

But six generals, it appeared to me there are a few more, but that is the count that I had, they appear to be positioning themselves for some future role in politics. If we watch them, I believe we will see one or more emerge as at least an adviser to a Presidential candidate, if not a Presidential candidate themselves.

But I will see your six generals and I will raise you 9,000 30-Somethings. There are 9,000 generals in the United States military, and they stand with the commander in chief. So you have a long way to go to convince me that just because you find six folks with political aspirations, we should alter our entire mission in Iraq to accommodate

them. They would find something else to be critical of.

And the most outrageous statement of all from the gentleman from Florida, We have a plan in the war in Iraq. His question to Republicans was: Where is your plan?

Well, I think maybe he got that script wrong. I think he probably understands that we do have a plan in the war in Iraq. It is the commander in chief's plan. I support it. I support moving towards freedom for the Iraqi people.

My question is, 30-Something Democrats, people who think "Republican" is a four-letter word, where is your plan? And I would further submit that after 60 minutes of that kind of diatribe, I wonder what the suicide rate in America is, Mr. Speaker?

Actually, I came here to talk about a different subject matter. What I want to talk about is the accomplishment that we made here on the floor of Congress today; and that is, for a long time the American people have understood something that has taken quite awhile to go through to this Congress and the White House. That is, we have porous borders in America.

The American people understand when they see people show up in their streets, taking jobs in their communities, and when children are coming into their schools and they are born in a foreign country and they don't have the kind of documents that would demonstrate that they have come in through a legal channel, and they start to see 1,000 of them show up and take jobs, and in Iowa, for example, it would be in our packing plants, there is a real large social movement going on.

□ 2215

The blastosphere opened up and began to tell America the facts of it all, and some of people came down to the floor of the Congress and made this case, my good friend TOM TANCREDO among those. The people understood this immigration issue long before Congress was able to react.

We need to be in a position to lead, not to follow. But this time I think we are following the lead of the American people, and I am happy to do that, although I would like to be a little more up front.

But that message came to this floor over and over again, led by TOM TANCREDO of Colorado, and a number of the rest of us stepped in and joined him. We have been carrying that message consistently at heart now for a number of years, for me it is 4 years here in this Congress, carrying this message.

I sent out a survey into my congressional district, it will be 2 years ago last March, and it went to 10,000 households randomly selected by a computer, so it would have been Democrats, Independents and Republicans scattered across the district in a random location, and it was a survey on immigration.

I knew what I thought. I believe we need to enforce our immigration laws, seal our border, force all traffic to ports of entry, and birthright citizenship and the anchor babies, shut off the jobs magnet, do all those things and a lot of people go back home. I believe a lot of people do that. I believe the record is replete with statements to that effect and a number of pieces of policy that add to that overall philosophy.

But the immigration survey that I sent out to the number of 10,000 randomly selected households asked a whole series of questions about immigration. That was the only subject matter. The most significant question that I asked in that survey was on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the most intense, how intensively do you agree with this statement, and then the statement reads, in the survey, that we should eliminate all illegal immigration and reduce legal immigration.

Reducing legal immigration is not something that I have actually called for, but, and all illegal immigration, reduce legal immigration, and how intensively do you agree with this, with 10 being the most intense. Out of 10,000 mailed, we received 1,800 and, I think the number was 96 respondents. So a number that approached 19 percent returned, which is about 3 times what your average return rate would be on that kind of a mailing.

On that question, we should end all illegal immigration, and reduce legal, how intensively do you agree, 82 percent put down 10, 82 percent. Some of them must have held their pen like a dagger the way they wrote their notes and their comments on the surveys.

As I went through those and read them through, 82 percent said end illegal immigration, all of it; reduce legal. By the time you added the 7s, 8s, 9s to those 10s, 97 percent agreed with that statement, and only 3 percent had an opinion down on the other side of the scale, only 3 percent.

I would submit that if I sent a survey out to the district with a random selection like that, and I said STEVE KING says the sun comes up in the east, do you agree or disagree, I do not believe I would get a 97 percent agreement out of my congressional district, but 97 percent want to have border control, and they want to have enforcement. That is what we tried to provide in this Congress, and we have made some significant progress.

Last August 22, I have to back up, it was a year ago last August 22, is a little over a year ago, I hosted an immigration summit in Iowa. I started out in Des Moines with radio and a lot of print coverage and some video coverage on there. I had a host of very good speakers on the immigration issue, TOM TANCREDO came, my good friend from Arizona and powerful leader on the subject, J.D. HAYWORTH from Arizona; Jim Gilchrest was there, who was the original founder of the Minute-

We had other speakers that added on to that, and one was the father of a son who was lost in the September 11 attack in New York, Kris Eggle, and they spoke about the importance of enforcement of immigration laws. But if we had done so, we may be and likely could have thwarted the attacks on September 11.

But what happens to this country if we continue our porous borders. On that day I stood up and said, I want to build a fence, I want to put a physical barrier on this border, and I want to do it for 2,000 miles. For starters I would put a 10 foot high chain link fence, and I would top it with barb wire. I said barb wire because I am kind of a farm country young guy.

The press printed it as razor wire. I don't take issue with that, probably razor wire makes a little more sense than barb wire. But I would put the fence there. I would move it about 100 feet, and I would build a concrete wall that I designed and demonstrated on this floor in Congress. It is unlikely that I will get an opportunity to demonstrate that tonight, but that's the position that I took August 22, 2005.

I have here with me the clippings from some of the newspapers after that. They were not very impressed with that idea. They thought it was a kind of radical, reactionary and ineffective proposal. So there are about four articles here that have reference to that, and they mostly undermine my position and seek to ridicule me for having a, apparently, narrow mind and not having thought this through.

What this they forgot, that I go to the border, I look at the circumstances down there. I gather the data, I talk to the Border Patrol personnel. I talk to the people that live there. I talk to the retired Border Patrol personnel. I see the carnage, I see the litter. I go to the national parks and talk to the park rangers there.

When they have human traffic that is streaming across that border and the numbers that they are, and I sit down there on the border, in the dark, for hours, utterly quiet, and listen, listen when I can't see, but just dim shadows is all that I can see. I can hear vehicles coming from the Mexican side of the border, and they stop by a big mesquite tree about 150 or so yards out there south of the border. The fence is just a fine barb wire fence, the wires are stretched apart in places, that is where the illegals go through. They don't fix it back up, as one could imagine. They leave it open for others.

There was a water tank that was there on the Mexican side that is there. That was where they can get their last load up of water before they start off on 20, 25 miles of desert on the U.S. side to be picked up the highway a ways. I sit there and listen, and I hear the vehicles come down through the desert.

On one particular vehicle, I could hear the muffler dragging all the way along. They get by that mesquite tree,

and they stop and the doors open. Then you have to listen, and you can hear the sounds, and it is people clearly piling out of the vehicle. You can hear them drop their packs on the ground as they get out, and they must be picking them back up again.

You can hear a little bit of talk, a little bit of whisper. Then they start off through the mesquite to come out into the border to come into the United States.

You can hear their packs go through the fence and be set on the ground on the other side, and sometimes occasionally dropped on the ground. You hear them climb through the fence, they pick their packs back up. You can see the shadows. You can't quite count them, you can see the image of the shadows as they go off and into the desert off north, following whatever kind of a beacon they have and may be watching, however they guide themselves, to go on into the United States.

Now, this happens across that border on an average night of perhaps 11,000 people pouring across that border a night, 11,000, to the tune of 4 million a year.

How do I know this, I serve on the Immigration subcommittee. I sit in on hearings two, three, four times a week, witnesses that come forth, they are both expert on the matter, both pro and con, experts that bring real data to us.

The Border Patrol's information is this, that they stopped, last year, 1,188,000 illegal border crossers, 1,188,000. What a huge number. Santa Ana's Army was only 6,000 strong, and the Border Patrol stopped 1,188,000? What a huge universe of people that is. Theoretically at least they turned themselves and said go back through there and many of them they took down to the turnstile and watched them as they went back in Mexico.

The year before the Border Patrol stopped 1,159,000. So I asked the question, of the Border Patrol, and of their representative, what percentage of the attempts across the border do you intercept? What percentage of success do you have? The answer that I get back consistently is 25 to 33 percent.

When I go down to the border, and I ask the Border Patrol that is actually doing the work down there, what percentage are you interdicting, and they give me answers like, the most consistent answer I got was 10 percent. I don't know if that really is it. One of them when I said 25 percent broke up in hysterical laughter. He said, no, that number is closer to 3 percent of the drugs and 5 percent of the illegals.

Now, that was an ICE inspector that should know, even if they are wrong. Now, if they are right, it is more than 10 million a year. If they are wrong, and the testimony of 25 to 33 percent, and this is all a guess, admittedly, then it is perhaps 4 million a year coming across our southern border.

Now, how many go back? We don't know the answer to that either. We

know some go back. We don't know if it is big numbers, as a percentage, but we know it will be big numbers because there are 4 million or so that do go across. We also know that 65 billion, that is billion with a B, dollars worth of illegal drug, come across our southern border every year.

Ninety percent of the illegal drugs in America are coming across our southern border. Sometimes they come across in semis, sometimes they come across in straight trucks, sometimes they come across in pickup trucks.

In fact, while I was down there, they interdicted a pickup truck that had a false bed in it, about 7 inches of false bed. Underneath there, there were 18 bags of marijuana, about the size of a cement sack, perhaps weighing about 10 pounds each.

I will submit 180 to 200 pounds of marijuana underneath the false bed in the pickup. We took the jaws-of-life and pried it open, went in there and pulled those sacks out. The driver, I am going to tell you, I believe, was a MS-13 gang member, the most violent gang we have ever seen in this hemisphere, the gangs that behead and dismember and do other things so atrocious I will not repeat them on the floor of this Congress.

This individual had a MS-13 tattooed on his arm here, he had tattoos from his waist to his neck. He had every look about him as an MS-13. He was perhaps a decoy, because they get so many interdictions of drugs down there, they cannot prosecute them all. So they will send off someone who has got a smaller load, 180 to 200 pounds, to be a diversion to be able to run the larger load through there, cost of doing business.

Well, if one spends a few hours down on the border at night and listens and perhaps would have infrared night vision of some kind that they could watch, actually watch the people, they would come to the conclusion that it isn't the folks that are coming into the United States that want to simply get a job working on farms or whatever it is they do to improve their lives, just they are coming here for a better life.

Actually, the position that has been taken by the administration, we cannot stop people that want to come into the United States for a better life. It is too powerful a force. We have to let them come in and legitimize them by giving them some kind of identification.

But I would submit that we can stop people from coming into the United States for a job, for a better life. We must be able to stop people from doing that, because the force that drives them isn't nearly as powerful as the force that drives people to bring illegal drugs into the United States.

So I am going to say we can stop lettuce pickers and people that want to work on farms and factories in plants. We must do that, because if we can't do that, we don't have a hope of being able to stop the illegal drug smugglers that are coming into the United States.

So when they come through in a semi, which is more rare now, or smuggle through in a straight truck, when there has been a diversion, or maybe a pickup load gets through with the marijuana load under the bed, when that all happens, large quantities of illegal drugs come into the United States.

But that is not the only way they come in. They also come in on the backs of burros, individuals who are sneaking into the United States with 50 pounds of marijuana on their back. They might back 15 miles or further to get to the United States border to walk across the U.S. desert, and then get across that border, as ICE described while I saw there, and walk across the United States and walk another 20, 25 miles and be picked up along the highway somewhere.

They toss their marijuana into the truck. Some get into the truck and go on and stay in the United States. Some return back to Mexico and get another load. Some turn around and walk back, all the way across the desert to get another load. That is the kind of thing that is going on.

With that kind of force on the border, with that kind of push, a push of 4 million people a year coming across that border, intercepting 1,188,000 of them, \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs; 90 percent of the illegal drugs in America coming across that border, that includes the marijuana, the cocaine, the heroin and the methamphetamine, which is a big, big problem.

We have shut down the meth labs essentially in Iowa. That just meant that it used to be 85 percent of the meth came from Mexico and Iowa. Now it is much closer to 95 or more percent of the methamphetamine comes from Mexico because we shot down the meth labs in Iowa.

□ 2230

But these burreros will haul 50 pounds of marijuana each and they will come in groups of say 8 to 10, 10 to 12, up to 50. In fact, there is a pack train of them that went up to 100, each with marijuana on their back, roughly 50 pounds, carrying that across the desert. And they drop litter all over the desert, Mr. Speaker, and invade our natural areas.

In fact here I have here on this stand a picture of a natural area, and it is quite interesting. This is a picture of one of four locations where the long-nosed bat, an endangered species, inhabits a nest. And this is on the Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona.

I have met with the National Park Service director, and this location is the location where this bat cave, as you see was invaded by illegals. This was one of their stopoff points. They could get in there and get cool and rest up a little bit for their trek across the desert.

So as they came into this bat cave, they chased out something like 1,600

bats that lived in there, and the bats left. We don't know where they went to nest, necessarily, at least I don't, but for 2 years there wasn't a bat in this cave. So now we are down to three locations where these rare, long-nosed bats can live and reproduce.

So the National Park Service looked at this and said boy, we really don't like to build fences around in our refuge, but what are our alternatives if we want to save the bats? So they followed a path that seemed to work, and that is put this wrought iron fence around here that has spikes that lean out, it is about a \$75,000 project, Mr. Speaker. They built a fence around the bat cave, and when they did that, the illegals did not come into the cave any longer and the bats came back. The bats have been in there reproducing ever since in roughly the same numbers they were before their cave was taken over by the continual flow of illegals that are coming across our natural refuge.

So, I would argue to those that say a fence doesn't work, here is a perfect example of how a fence worked. At least it kept them out of the cave, and now we have a species of bat that is going to be more healthy than they would have been otherwise.

This is just an interesting little thing that I did. I have said that the people that vote for amnesty will be branded with a scarlet letter A for amnesty. So, Mr. Speaker, by Ajo, Arizona, there is a big letter A up there on the mountainside. I took a picture of that. We colored it up so it is scarlet. That is the scarlet letter A. That is the brand. We don't need amnesty. That is why it has a bar across it. We need to have the rule of law. We need to respect the rule of law. That is part of America.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the fence and concrete wall that I designed. You can see this portion here, this will be slip-form footing that goes down perhaps 5 feet, and it would be 5 feet, and you form a slot in there and you can put a trencher in and put this slip form in and pull it all in one motion and pour concrete as you go, trench and pour concrete. So this gray portion becomes the footing, and you can see where the white portion drops down, and that is the slot.

These are pre-cast concrete panels, Mr. Speaker, and they would be about 13½ feet long. They drop down into this slot, I think that says 15 inches, perhaps 18, but we end up with a constructed height of 12 feet high.

These precast panels weigh about 9,800 pounds. They come in on trucks. You pick them up with a crane, you drop them in that slot. You can just pop them in one after the other, just as easily as I have demonstrated on this floor how that can be done.

Once they are put together, you can put a little wire on top. That wire is a disincentive for people from climbing over the top. You can put sensors on there, vibration sensors. We can put night vision on there. We can do all

kinds of things to make sure that this wall is not breached, Mr. Speaker.

Walls make sense. Fences make sense. The bat cave is safe from the illegals. We can make America safe from the illegals by simply spending some of this hard-earned cash. The \$8 billion being spent to fund our Border Patrol on the southern border, we can make a one-time capital investment. It is about \$4 million a mile now being spent to control our border and we get about 25 percent efficiency.

If we would spend about \$2 million a mile all the way through those 2,000 miles, we would end up with a far higher percentage of efficiency. I believe that number would go over 95 percent, if we patrol the border, if we put the sensors on.

Surely a fence isn't the only solution, but it is a great big, wonderful effective tool for our Border Patrol. They could finally aspire to get operational control of the border.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there needs to be a solution for the locations where water is going to run across through the gullies. We have these solutions in place in many of those locations already. These are H-beams that are driven in, steel beams that are staggered and welded together here on top with a horizontal beam so they can't be spread apart. This lets the water through. It will collect the trash and over time you have to clean the trash up, but no one can go through there except some wildlife can get through, and it does work. It is a little more expensive, but we will have to do that where the water runs. There are engineering solutions to everything we might want to do.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an example of what is happening to our national parks. I am not certain whether this is in Oregon Pipe Cactus National Monument or in the Cabeza Prieta. But it doesn't matter. This is federally preserved land. This is precious natural resources that we want Americans to have access to.

Look at what we have. Graffiti painted on the stones. Graffiti that probably will take years and years and years to ever weather away, if it does at all, something that is really very difficult to clean up when the paint goes into the pores of the stone.

Down here is just a small example of the kind of litter that we are finding in our national parks. Some of that litter, it is estimated that an average illegal will drop about 8 pounds of litter as they cross the desert. Eight pounds times 4 million people is a tremendous cleanup problem, and it threatens our natural resources, Mr. Speaker. It threatens the wildlife.

In fact, about one-third of Oregon Pipe Cactus National Monument is now off limits to the public because the concentration of illegals is so intense that the park officers fear for the safety of American tourists in our own national parks because they are threatened.

And that would be the Oregon Pipe Cactus Monument where there officer Kris Eggle was killed in a shootout with drug smugglers coming across the border. I have been to that location. There is a memorial that is there. In his memory and the memory of the other officers who have given their lives for security, I am committed to security for this border.

So today, Mr. Speaker, we passed 700 miles of fence off the floor of this Congress. This is the third time we have had a good fence vote here on the floor, by my recollection. The Senate has had two good fence votes over there. They are going to get another one. They are going to get this bill. I am happy to call it the King bill, thanks to PETER KING from New York.

They are going to get a bill over there, and my advice is to the U.S. Senate, chew on that awhile. I expect the voters will chew on you awhile. We are going to take this message to the American people and say let us continue with this message on enforcement.

Fences work. There is proof positive that they do. No one says where we have built them that we should tear them down. They are essential tools. They are a capital investment, they are a one-time investment, and, yes, we have to patrol, and, yes, we have to maintain them, but we get a great return on that capital investment.

That means it doesn't take as many Border Patrol officers to secure this border. It means that they can be deployed to places where they can be more effective. It means that the 4 million people that are coming across our border and the \$65 billion worth of drugs will have to find a way to try to sneak through a port of entry, which many will try to do, and we can beef those up and put more resources there, or they will go around the ocean and get out there where the Coast Guard can do their job, Mr. Speaker, and the Coast Guard has interdiction abilities that supersede those, or I will say they are superior to the Border Patrol.

So, I am ready to force all traffic through the ports of entry. I think we must do that. I call upon the United States Senate to pass the legislation that we passed on the floor here today.

August 22, 2005, I said build a fence, build a wall, build a barrier. 114 days later, this Congress passed that legislation as part of a larger bill. And I have watched as perhaps the most liberal Member of the United States Senate voted to authorize a fence and voted to fund a fence.

This extreme notion that comes from a conservative Member of Congress is mainstream, Mr. Speaker. The White House recognizes we need physical barriers to assist and that we need to have enforcement at the border.

We will have that. We will get that done and we are moving quickly. It won't all be done by November 7, but a lot of the pieces will be put in place by this Republican Congress.

And I am proud to serve with you all, and I am looking forward to being part of this solution. I am looking forward to going down and setting some posts myself.

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 2006]

IRAQI PRIME MINISTER ADDRESSES CONGRESS  
AL-MALIKI (through translator). Thank you. Thank you.

In the name of God, the most gracious, the most merciful, Your Excellency, the Speaker of the House, Mr. Vice President, honorable ladies and gentlemen, members of Congress, it is with great pleasure that I am able to take this opportunity to be the first democratically and constitutionally elected prime minister of Iraq to address you, the elected representatives of the American people. And I thank you for affording me this unique chance to speak at this respected assembly.

Let me begin by thanking the American people, through you, on behalf of the Iraqi people, for supporting our people and ousting dictatorship. Iraq will not forget those who stood with her and who continues to stand with her in times of need.

Thank you for your continued resolve in helping us fight the terrorists plaguing Iraq, which is a struggle to defend our nation's democracy and our people who aspire to liberty, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. All of those are not Western values; they are universal values for humanity.

They are as much for me the pinnacle embodiment of my faith and religion, and they are for all free spirits.

The war on terror is a real war against those who wish to burn out the flame of freedom. And we are in this vanguard for defending the values of humanity.

I know that some of you here question whether Iraq is part of the war on terror. Let me be very clear: This is a battle between true Islam, for which a person's liberty and rights constitute essential cornerstones, and terrorism, which wraps itself in a fake Islamic cloak; in reality, waging a war on Islam and Muslims and values.

And spreads hatred between humanity, contrary to what come in our Koran, which says, "We have created you of male and female and made you tribes and families that you know each other." Surely (inaudible) of you in the sight of God is the best concept.

The truth is that terrorism has no religion. Our faith says that who kills an innocent, as if they have killed all mankind.

Thousands of lives were tragically lost on September 11th when these impostors of Islam reared their ugly head. Thousands more continue to die in Iraq today at the hands of the same terrorists who show complete disregard for human life.

Your loss on that day was the loss of all mankind, and our loss today is lost for all free people.

And wherever humankind suffers a loss at the hands of the terrorists, it is a loss of all of humanity.

It is your duty and our duty to defeat this terror. Iraq is the front line in this struggle, and history will prove that the sacrifices of Iraqis for freedom will not be in vain. Iraqis are your allies in the war on terror.

History will record their bravery and humanity.

The fate of our country and yours is tied. Should democracy be allowed to fail in Iraq and terror permitted to triumph, then the war on terror will never be won elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, we are building the new Iraq on the foundation of democracy and are erecting it through our belief in the rights of every individual—just as Saddam has destroyed it through his abuse of all those rights—so that future Iraqi generations can live in peace, prosperity and hope.

Iraqis have tasted freedom and we will defend it absolutely.

Every human possesses inalienable rights which transcend religion. As it is taken in the International Convention of Human Rights, they transcend religion, race and gender.

And God says in the Koran, "and surely we have honored all children of Adam."

I believe these human rights are not an artifact construct reserved for the few. They are the divine entitlement for all.

It is on this unwavering belief that we are determined to build our nation, a land whose people are free, whose air (ph) is liberty, and where the rule of law is supreme.

This is the new Iraq, which is emerging from the ashes of dictatorship and despite the carnage of extremists, a country which respects international conventions and practices noninterference in the internal affairs of others, relies on dialogue to resolve differences, and strives to develop strong relations with every country that espouses freedom and peace.

We are working diligently so that Iraq returns to take the position it deserves and it plays a positive role in its regional and international environment as a key, active player in spreading security and stability, to give an example of a positive relationship between countries through denouncement of violence and resorting to constructive dialogue, solving problems between nations and peoples.

And we have made progress. And we are correcting the damage inflicted by politics of the previous regime, in particular with our neighbors.

My presence here is a testament of the new politics of a democratic Iraq.

Ladies and gentlemen, in a short space of time, Iraq has gone from a dictatorship to a transitional administration, and now to a fully fledged democratic government.

This has happened despite the best efforts of the terrorists who are bent on either destroying democracy or Iraq, but by the courage of our people who defied the terrorists every time they were called upon to make a choice, by risking their lives for the ballot box. They have stated over and over again, with their ink-stained fingers waving in pride, that they will always make the same choice.

Over fear . . .

PROTESTER: Iraqis want the troops to leave! Bring them home now! Iraqis want the troops to leave! Bring them home now!

HASTERT: If our honored guest will suspend for the moment, the chair notes disturbance in the gallery. The sergeant at arms will secure order by removing those engaging in disruption.

PROTESTER: Bring them home now!

HASTERT: The gentleman may resume.

AL-MALIKI (through translator): Hope over fear; liberty over oppression; dignity over submission; democracy over dictatorship; federalism over a centralist state.

Let there be no doubt: Today Iraq is a democracy which stands firm because of the sacrifices of its people and the sacrifices of all those who stood with us in this crisis from nations and countries.

And that's why—thank you—I would like to thank them very much for all their sacrifices.

Iraqis of all persuasions took part in the unanimously democratic election for the first parliament formed under the country's first permanent constitution after eight decades of temporary constitutions and dictatorship, a constitution written by the elected representatives of the people and ratified by the people.

Iraqis succeeded in forming a government of national unity based on an elected par-

liamentary foundation, and includes all of Iraq's religions, ethnicities and political groupings.

The journey has been perilous, and the future is not guaranteed. Yet many around the world who underestimated the resolve of Iraq's people and were sure that we would never reach this stage. Few believed in us. But you, the American people, did, and we are grateful for this.

The transformation in Iraq can sometimes be forgotten in the daily, futile violence.

Since liberation, we have witnessed great accomplishments in politics, the economy and civil society. We have gone from a one-party state, ruled by a small elite, to a multi-party system where politics is the domain of every citizen and parties compete at all levels.

What used to be a state-controlled media is now completely free and uncensored, something Iraq had never witnessed since its establishment as a modern state and something which remains alien to most of the region.

What used to be a command economy in Iraq, we are rapidly transforming into a free market economy.

In the past three years, our GDP per capita has more than doubled. And it is expected that our economy will continue to grow. Standards of living have been raised for most Iraqis as the markets witness an unprecedented level of prosperity. Many individuals are buying products and appliances which they would never have hoped to afford in the past.

And, in keeping with our economic vision of creating a free market economy, we will be presenting to parliament legislation which will lift current restrictions on foreign companies and investors who wish to come to Iraq.

While we are making great economic strides, the greatest transformation has been on Iraqi society.

We have gone from mass graves and torture chambers and chemical weapons to a flourishing—to the rule of law and human rights.

The human rights and freedoms embodied in the new Iraq and consolidated in the constitution have provided a fertile environment for the ever-growing number of civil society institutions which are increasing in scope and complexity and provide a healthy reflection of what is developing beneath the violence.

The rights chartered in the constitution will also help consolidate the role of women in public life as equals to men.

And help them to play a greater role in political life.

I am proud to say that a quarter of Iraq's Council of Representatives is made up of women, but we still have much to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, our nascent democracy faces numerous challenges and impediments, but our resolve is unbreakable and we will overcome them.

The greatest threat Iraq's people face is terror: terror inflicted by extremists who value no life and who depend on the fear their wanton murder and destruction creates.

They have poured acid into Iraq's dictatorial wounds and created many of their own.

Iraq is free, and the terrorists cannot stand this.

They hope to undermine our democratically elected government through the random killing of civilians. They want to destroy Iraq's future by assassinating our leading scientific, political and community leaders. Above all, they wish to spread fear.

Do not think that this is an Iraqi problem. This terrorist front is a threat to every free

country in the world and their citizens. What is at stake is nothing less than our freedom and liberty.

Confronting and dealing with this challenge is the responsibility of every liberal democracy that values its freedom. Iraq is the battle that will determine the war. If, in continued partnership, we have the strength of mind and commitment to defeat the terrorists and their ideology in Iraq, they will never be able to recover.

For the sake of success of the political process, I launched the National Reconciliation Initiative, which aims to draw in groups willing to accept the logic of dialogue and participation. This olive branch has received the backing of Iraq's parliamentary blocs and support further affield from large segments of the population.

I remain determined to see this initiative succeed.

But let our enemies not mistake our outstretched hand for forgiveness as a sign of weakness. Whoever chooses violence against the people of Iraq, then the fate that awaits them will be the same that of the terrorist Zarqawi.

While political and economic efforts are essential, defeating terror in Iraqi relies fundamentally on the building of sound Iraqi force, both in quantity and capability. The completion of Iraq's forces form the necessary basis for the withdrawal of multinational forces. But it's only then, only when Iraq's forces are fully capable, will the job of the multinational forces be complete.

Our Iraqi forces have accomplished much and have gained a great deal of field experience to eventually enable them to triumph over the terrorists and to take over the security portfolio and extend peace through the country.

The other impediment to Iraq's stability are the armed militias. I have on many occasions stated my determination to disband all militias without exception and re-establish a state monopoly on arms and to guarantee citizens security so that they do not need others to provide it.

It is imperative that the reconstruction starts now.

While small sections of central Iraq are unstable, large sections have remained peaceful, but ignored. For far too long, these were most deprived areas of Iraq under the previous regime and have been the most valiant in Iraq's struggle for freedom. We need to make an example out of these stable areas as models for the rest of the country.

Reconstruction projects in these areas will tackle unemployment, which will weaken the terrorists. They will become prototypes for other, more volatile regions aspire to. Undoubtedly, reconstruction in these areas will fuel economic growth and show what a prosperous, stable, democratic and federal Iraq would look like.

Members of the Congress, in this effort, we need your help. We need the help of the international community.

Much of the budget you had allocated for Iraq's reconstruction ended up paying for security firms and foreign companies, whose operating costs were vast. Instead, there needs to be a greater reliance on Iraqis and Iraqi companies, with foreign aid and assistance to help us rebuild Iraq.

We are rebuilding Iraq on a new, solid foundation: that of liberty, hope and equality. Iraq's democracy is young, but the will of its people is strong. It is because of this spirit and desire to be free that Iraq has taken the opportunity you gave us and we chose democracy.

We faced tyranny and oppression under the former regime. And we now face a different kind of terror. We did not know then and we will not bow now.